

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application of

Won-hee Choe et al.

Application No.: 10/622,433

Filing Date:

July 21, 2003

Group Art Unit: 3663

Examiner: MATTHEW LUU

Confirmation No.: 4965

Commination No.: 4905

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR RENDERING COLOR IMAGE ON DELTA-STRUCTURED

DISPLAYS

Commissioner for Patents

AMENDMENT/REPLY TRANSMITTAL LETTER

P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Sir: Enclosed is a reply for the above-identified patent application. ☐ A Petition for Extension of Time is also enclosed. Terminal Disclaimer(s) and the \$65.00 (2814) \$130.00 (1814) fee per Disclaimer due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d) are also enclosed. Also enclosed is/are ___ ☐ Small entity status is hereby claimed. Applicant(s) requests continued examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and enclose the □ \$395.00 (2801) □ \$790.00 (1801) fee due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(e). Applicant(s) requests that any previously unentered after final amendments <u>not</u> be entered. Continued examination is requested based on the enclosed documents identified above. Applicant(s) previously submitted ___ on for which continued examination is requested. ☐ Applicant(s) requests suspension of action by the Office until at least which does not exceed three months from the filing of this RCE, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.103(c). The required fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i) is enclosed. A Request for Entry and Consideration of Submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.129(a) (1809/2809) is also

Buchanan Ingersoll PC

enclosed.

Page 1 of 2 (8/05)

Attorney Docket No. <u>1030681-000536</u> Application No. <u>10/622,433</u>

M	No additional claim fee is required.
	An additional claim fee is required, and is calculated as shown below.

AMENDED CLAIMS								
	No. of Claims	Highest of Clair Previou Paid F	ms sly	Extra Claims		Ra	te	Additional Fee
Total Claims		MINUS	II	0	×	\$50.00	(1202) =	\$ 0.00
Independent Claims		MINUS	_ =	0	×	\$200.00	(1201) =	\$ 0.00
If Amendment adds multiple dependent claims, add \$360.00 (1203)								
Total Claim Amendment Fee							\$ 0.00	
Small Entity Status claimed - subtract 50% of Total Claim Amendment Fee						\$ 0.00		
TOTAL ADDITIONAL CLAIM FEE DUE FOR THIS AMENDMENT							\$ 0.00	

A check i	n the amount of	is enclosed for the fee due.
Charge _	to Deposit Acc	count No. 02-4800.
Charge	to credit card.	Form PTO-2038 is attached.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800. This paper is submitted in duplicate.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404 (703) 836-6620

Date: May 15, 2006_____

Charles F. Wieland III Registration No 33,096

Attorney's Docket No. <u>1030681-000536</u>

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MAY 1 5 2006

In re Patent Application of

Won-hee Choe et al.

Application No.: 10/622,433

Filed: July 21, 2003

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR

RENDERING COLOR IMAGE ON DELTA-STRUCTURED DISPLAYS

MAIL STOP AF

Group Art Unit: 3663

Examiner: MATTHEW LUU

Confirmation No.: 4965

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the final Office Action dated March 15, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-captioned application. Applicants note with appreciation the continued indication that claims 2-4, 6, 10-12 and 14 contain allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 13 also contain allowable subject matter.

The final Office Action includes a rejection of claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over the Messing et al patent publication (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0061710) in view of the Shiraishi et al patent (U.S. Patent 5,280,347) or the Inuiya et al patent (U.S. Patent 6,882,364). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for at least the following reasons.